V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

Program # 2
1. Name of the Planned Program
Economics of Crop Production

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
<th>%1862 Extension</th>
<th>%1890 Extension</th>
<th>%1862 Research</th>
<th>%1890 Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Economics of Agricultural Production and Farm Management</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Business Management, Finance, and Taxation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Market Economics</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Marketing and Distribution Practices</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year: 2009</th>
<th>Extension 1862 Plan</th>
<th>Extension 1862 Actual</th>
<th>Research 1862 Plan</th>
<th>Research 1862 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Lever 3b &amp; 3c</td>
<td>280800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890 Extension</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans-Allen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862 Matching</td>
<td>421200</td>
<td>1862 Matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890 Matching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1890 Matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862 All Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1862 All Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890 All Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1890 All Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity
   - Identify emerging issues
   - Provide enterprise budgets, resource use alternatives, crop insurance options, marketing strategies and other resource material reflecting best management practices.
   - Evaluate effectiveness of alternative management practices.
   - Develop presentation materials.
   - Offer in-service education, presentations and workshops.

2. Brief description of the target audience
   - Owners, managers and employees of farm operations
   - Marketing club members and facilitators
   - Agribusiness and government agency personnel
V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Direct Contacts Adults</th>
<th>Indirect Contacts Adults</th>
<th>Direct Contacts Youth</th>
<th>Indirect Contacts Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>7250</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)

Patent Applications Submitted

Year: 2009
Plan: 0
Actual: 0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

• {No Data Entered}
## V(G). State Defined Outcomes

### V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O. No.</th>
<th>Outcome Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of producers and others attending workshops, marketing clubs and other events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of participants demonstrating an increase in subject knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evidence of producers employing enterprise budgets, using computerized decision-making tools, writing marketing plans and adopting recommended management tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of marketing clubs in the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evidence of producers having a more productive working relationship with agriculture service personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Evidence of producers implementing activities indicated by the management tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evidence of benefits from marketing club participation and best management practice implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Estimated value of adopted best management practices to the individual and to the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Number of agricultural producers, agricultural lenders, extension agents, crop insurance agents, and county FSA directors who increased their knowledge of key provisions of the 2008 Farm Bill so that informed decisions would be made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Number of producers and others attending workshops, marketing clubs and other events.

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #2

1. Outcome Measures

Number of participants demonstrating an increase in subject knowledge and skills.

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #3

1. Outcome Measures

Evidence of producers employing enterprise budgets, using computerized decision-making tools, writing marketing plans and adopting recommended management tools.

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #4

1. Outcome Measures

Number of marketing clubs in the state.

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #5

1. Outcome Measures

Evidence of producers having a more productive working relationship with agriculture service personnel.

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #6

1. Outcome Measures

Evidence of producers implementing activities indicated by the management tools.

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #7

1. Outcome Measures

Evidence of benefits from marketing club participation and best management practice implementation.

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure
Outcome #8

1. Outcome Measures

Estimated value of adopted best management practices to the individual and to the state.

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #9

1. Outcome Measures

Number of agricultural producers, agricultural lenders, extension agents, crop insurance agents, and county FSA directors who increased their knowledge of key provisions of the 2008 Farm Bill so that informed decisions would be made.

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantitative Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>{No Data Entered}</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

In 2008, Congress passed the "Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008" also known as the 2008 Farm Bill. Several new provisions were added to the bill, which has the potential to significantly impact the revenue and profitability of North Dakota farmers. One important provision was the optional Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE) program, which is an alternative revenue-based safety net that producers could voluntarily enroll in. The Supplemental Revenue Assistance Payments (SURE) program provides benefits for losses due to natural disasters which occur on a regular basis in North Dakota.

What has been done

As a starting point, several tutorials titled ACRE Basics, ACRE Program Analyzer (an in-depth Microsoft Excel(c) spreadsheet), and Should I Enroll in ACRE were developed by Extension economists. Popular news releases were issued to alert clients of the new Farm Bill provisions, sign-up dates, and when educational meetings were to be held. Numerous meetings were held to inform clients, and to train Extension agents, USDA-FSA county staff, and farm business management instructors on the use of the tutorials.

Results

Numerous clients received valuable education about important revenue enhancing provisions in the Farm Bill. One noteworthy outcome was that the SURE program had a provision called the Livestock Indemnity Program (LIP) which covered above normal livestock losses due to adverse weather, which definitely occurred in North Dakota in the spring 2009. Losses were valued at "75 percent of the market value the day before the loss occurred." So the value of new-born calves was much less than producers would receive for calves at normal fall marketing. Extension economists worked with an important Senator who was the author of the Farm Bill to develop a provision which ultimately raised the payment for new born calves from about $80 to $319.44. This four-fold increase in value proved to be economically critical for livestock producers who received approximately $17 Million in LIP payments. The majority of livestock losses were calves in 2009.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas
V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes
- Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations

Brief Explanation

The passage of the 2008 Farm Bill with new provisions created a wealth of educational opportunities. Severe spring blizzards and flooding in 2009 created many educational opportunities and applications of the SURE permanent disaster program. Government regulations were enacted to address important wind energy issues.

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

1. Evaluation Studies Planned
   - After Only (post program)

Evaluation Results

For the 2008 Farm Bill educational programs, the evaluation summary was completed by 238 attendees (79 percent of attendance) at four meetings that were held in October 2009.

The following questions were rated on a scale of 1 to 7, with 7 being highest and 1 being lowest.
1) The objectives of the session were beneficial: 5.81 (238 responses)
2) The stated objectives were met: 5.80 (238 responses)
3) The structure/format level was: 5.81 (237 responses)
4) The meeting facilities were: 5.55 (238 responses)
5) The work of the presenter(s) was: 6.02 (238 responses)
6) The materials were: 5.68 (237 responses)
7) The ideas and activities presented were interesting: 5.83 (237 responses)
8) My attendance at this event should prove beneficial: 5.73 (237 responses)
9) Overall, I consider this learning experience: 5.85 (235 responses)
10) Give an example of something you gained from this session which may help you in your operation:
   - Update on government programs &dash good. Update on 2010 costs, etc. &dash good.
   - Understanding of ACRE and economic outlook
   - USDA programs and crop outlook
   - Comparison of government programs and crop insurance
   - USDA programs are quite complicated.
   - Great job of understanding USDA programs

Key Items of Evaluation